



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

B.C. cut them off from the districts from which their predecessors had been wont to draw their supply of new troops. The serious dependence of the domestic policy of the Ptolemies upon their foreign policy has not, I venture to think, been stressed sufficiently by M. Lesquier.

Three points noted at random will indicate how much this book offers to those who are not specialists in Egyptian history: (1) The normal infantryman's lot in Egypt contained thirty jugera, as did the holding of land given by Tiberius Gracchus to his new Roman soldiers. (2) The various *ethne* in the Ptolemaic army, like the Jews in Alexandria, were governed by their own laws. (3) The sons of the Ptolemaic military cleruchs—οἱ τῆς ἐπιτοῦνης—played much the same rôle in the recruiting of the Ptolemies as the sons begotten by Roman soldiers from the women in the neighborhood of their camps—the so-called *ex castris*—played in providing the legions in the stationary *castra* with suitable candidates for some of their vacancies.

W. S. FERGUSON

The "Argonautica" of Apollonius Rhodius. Edited with introduction and commentary by GEORGE W. MOONEY, M.A. London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1912. Pp. 454.

Mr. Mooney is a pioneer. The *Argonautica* has been frequently translated into Latin, English, and other languages, but a commentary has not appeared for almost a century; and the exegesis in the editions of Hoelzlin, Shaw, Flangini, and Brunck-Schaefer is far inferior to the commentary provided for many other classical authors in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The present editor offers introductory chapters on the poet's life, the sources, the poem, other works of the poet, MSS, scholia, editions and translations; his text rests on no independent collations, but is apparently his own; his apparatus criticus is culled from Merkel and others with some additions from the critical studies of more recent years; an appendix deals with the question of double recension, and with meter; there are indexes of proper names, of Greek words treated in the notes, but not of subject-matter.

The purpose of the editor is not stated; we are not told whether he is addressing his work to scholars or to elementary students; he has provided a book that will immediately help the beginner in Hellenistic poetry and even the classical teacher who knows his Homer and Vergil, but has lacked courage to read Apollonius. Mr. Mooney, however, has made no effort to interpret, in the full sense of the term, either the poem or the poet. His introduction is a neat compilation of useful information; his notes give help in hard places, correct judiciously the translations of Way and others, the lexicons, and earlier editors, describe briefly Homeric and Apollonian usage, supply not a little in the way of parallel passages from earlier and contemporary poetry with the usual stock of material from Vergil and Valerius Flaccus, and explain allusions to people and places. The value of such

comment to the reader who is making his first acquaintance with the poet is clear; equally clear is the need, from a different standpoint, of a penetrating study of Apollonius' language and style not merely in comparison with Homer but with the *Koine*, of his art in comparison with that of Homer and Vergil, of all the many aspects of the poem,—for example, the legends, the topography, the relation of the third book to the romantic narratives of later days. The editor has wisely refrained from so ambitious an undertaking; his one volume would have grown beyond the limits of the publisher's endurance. We must, however, express some regret that Mr. Mooney shows no interest in these bigger things; so large a book might well reveal somewhere, if not always, a sense for the historical development of language or of literature; instead of this, we seldom get more than the pabulum of the schoolboy.

The textual apparatus is elaborate in comparison with that of the Oxford edition; it is compiled from earlier editions, chiefly Merkel's. The editor's thoroughness may be judged by the fact that, although about half a dozen papyrus-fragments of the *Argonautica* have been published since Seaton's edition, the apparatus never records them; this would be only a technical defect if the papyri contained no addition to our previous knowledge; but as it is, Porson's emendation in iii. 745 (which Mr. Mooney rejects) now has MS authority, Stephanus' reading of iii. 909 and Brunck's of iii. 263 are no longer merely emendations; furthermore, the condition of iii. 158 in the papyrus published in *Hermes* 35. 605 raises, perhaps, a new problem in the textual study of this verse; in any case, Gerhard need not have called his own emendation "tame and otiose": it now stands in a papyrus. Most of these papyri have appeared in the Oxyrhynchus series, which can hardly have been "unprocurable" at Trinity College. Mr. Mooney has printed at least three conjectures of his own (i. 517, 987, iv. 1647). He does not seem to have studied the textual difficulties, relatively few in Apollonius, very intensively: in iii. 882 he follows other editors in accepting Schneider's *ἀν*, but the MSS reading *αἰ* is supported by the existence of *οἱ δὲ δὴ ἄλλοι* and *αἱ δὲ δὴ ἄλλαι* as a tag at the end of verses in Apollonius (cf. e.g., iii. 872, 1170; iv. 334), and *ἄλσεα* in the next verse is dependent upon the preceding verb of motion. In iii. 892 he prints the MSS reading, as does the Oxford text, but Mr. Seaton marked it corrupt; Mr. Mooney makes strange sense out of it; he is right in saying that *ἵμεν* is protected by 896; we may add to that part of his argument that we have noted (from Wellauer's index) eleven other examples of *ἵμεν* in the poem; in ten cases, as here, it forms the arsis of the first foot, or followed by an initial consonant laps over into the second foot; when we add to this, that in nine cases it is preceded by a verb of motion, and in six of these nine by the aorist of *βαίνω*, may we suggest putting a full stop after *ἐνόησα*, and beginning the next verse with *βῆν ἵμεν*, supporting the construction with *μετ' ἀνδράσιν* by Mr. Mooney's reference to i. 648 (though we do not fully share his view that this reference justifies the dative with *μετά* after a verb of motion). Again, in i. 103 Mr. Mooney reads with

the MSS and many editors κοινήν; but this would be the only case of κοινός in Apollonius against seven examples of ξυνός; κοινός is not the epic word, as Boesch showed; nor does Mr. Mooney's apparatus record that the scholia offer κείνην as a variant and that Boesch, perhaps rightly, restores it to the text.

It is easier to discover the sources of Mr. Mooney's commentary than of Apollonius' poem. His etymologies come from Curtius and Fick, his Homeric syntax from Monro, his general syntax from Goodwin. Of recent etymology we learn nothing; of Stahl, of Gildersleeve, of syntactical studies in Hellenistic Greek outside of the syntactical dissertations on Apollonius never a word. This can only mean that we shall find a comparison of the usage of Homer and of Apollonius, which is altogether desirable and helpful, but not an interpretation of the syntax and usage of Apollonius. Boesch interprets the forms in Apollonius; Mr. Mooney has used Boesch's dissertation, but contents himself with describing forms; might he not at least refer to the pages of Boesch if he cannot afford the space for real interpretation? Many an optative is noted and described in its relation to Homeric and classical Greek, but of the Hellenistic optative the editor reveals no knowledge. It is interesting that the accusative appears with πειράζειν in iii. 10 contrary to Homeric usage and to Apollonius' practice elsewhere, but the significant fact is that the verb takes the accusative in the New Testament. The information given is usually accurate and neatly condensed; but how may ἔσπερον in ii. 1251 be equated with κνέφας in ii. 407 when the nominative ἔσπερος in *Homeric Hymns* 18. 14 shows clearly the adjectival use? Would Mr. Mooney have denied the idiomatic use of ἰδών in ii. 606, if he had read Radermacher's discussion (*Philol.* 59. 596)? The editor has added much illustrative material in the form of parallel passages, both from his own reading and from the dissertations on Apollonius, most of which he seems to have assimilated; Hesiod and the *Anthology* he might have used to a greater extent without exceeding his allotted space; Apollonius' use of ἀημαι (note on ii. 81) should be compared with Hesiod *Scut.* 8, *Homeric Hymns* iv. 277; with δμώλακες (ii. 396) cf. *A.P.* vii. 402. 3; with στεφάνης (ii. 918) cf. *A.P.* vii. 482. 4, 488. 4; viii. 179; with ii. 933-34 cf. *A.P.* IX. 287. 3; with γναθμοῖο κατασχομένη (iii. 128) cf. prehensa Cupidinis buccula, *Apul. Met.* vi. 22; with πολιοῖο (iii. 275) cf. *A.P.* vii. 485. 1; with iii. 1374 cf. *A.P.* vi. 122. 3-4.

There are many passages in which the interpretation would easily lead to long discussion beyond the compass of a review, but in the main Mr. Mooney's interpretations seem to us sane. The large amount of geographical commentary might easily have been eliminated by including a map; by this means space could have been obtained for intensive study of some aspects of either the language or the style of the poem. As it is, the "sunbeam" in iii. 756 is not carried beyond the *Aeneid*; that Ovid and Aristænetus and Dio Chrysostom also employed the figure may not interest the schoolboy, but

fills out the history of the famous simile. Literary appreciation Mr. Mooney seldom attempts; iii. 747 may be "one of the intensely human passages in Greek literature," but has it not also a taint of sensationalism that is truly Hellenistic? It is easier, however, to make reservations, corrections, and additions than it is to edit a Hellenistic poet who has long been neglected. Mr. Mooney has been courageous and, within well-defined limits, competent. He has made Apollonius accessible to a number of willing readers even if he has not contributed in any large measure to our knowledge of Hellenistic usage or of the many interesting aspects of Hellenistic poetry.

HENRY W. PRESCOTT

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Die sogenannten Sententiae Varronis. Von PETER GERMANN. III. Band, 6. Heft of Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des Altertums, herausgegeben von E. DRERUP. Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh, 1910. Pp. 99. M. 2.80.

In the *Einleitung*, pp. 1-6, the author traces the history of our knowledge of these *sententiae*, from the publication of part of them in certain works of Vincent of Beauvais, 1250-54, to the recension of the full collection given, in 1865, by A. Riese, on pp. 265-72 of his *M. Terenti Varronis Saturarum Menippearum Reliquiae*. In this valuable bibliographical survey the views of all who in books or articles have examined the collection are given. As early as 1624, it appears, the Varronian authorship of the *sententiae*, apparently attested by the ascriptions in the MSS, was questioned, but no one had exhaustively examined the matter. As late as 1856, Chappuis, in his elaborate discussion, had positively ascribed the collection to Varro; Riese had held that the *sententiae* were in part at least derived from Varro. Teuffel-Schwabe⁵ (see Warr's translation, § 169. 2) and Schanz, I, 2³, S. 450, were evidently not ready to deny absolutely the Varronian authorship, though Teuffel-Schwabe, after quoting five *sententiae* from the collection, said, "It is true that all these sayings remind us even more of Seneca in style and spirit."

There was, then, room for a definitive discussion of the *sententiae* with a view to determining, if possible, the authorship of the collection. To this end Germann, on pp. 7-29, deals with the interrelation of the MSS, as the basis of an authoritative text. The conclusions reached seem unassailable; the problems were, indeed, simple. On pp. 30-42 the text of the 158 *sententiae* is given, with an elaborate *apparatus criticus*, far more exhaustive and valuable than that in Riese. It seems regrettable, however, that the author did not indicate in his text, by typographical devices, departures from the MSS, and that he did not indicate, in a short *conspectus lectionum*, how far his text differs from Riese's. The differences appear, in fact, in only about fifteen places; in general Germann's text is the better.